H

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/382,438	08/25/1999	WILLIAM R. GARDNER	QCPA990482	5232

23696 7590 06/27/2003

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER
RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2665	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/382,438	Applicant(s) GARDNER ET AL.	
	Examiner Daniel J. Ryman	Art Unit 2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiedemann, Jr. (USPN 5,604,730) in view of Proctor (USPN 6,222,832) in further view of Walton, Jr. et al (USPN 5,621,723).

3. Regarding claim 10, Tiedemann discloses a method in a wireless communication system (col. 4, lines 53-61), comprising: designating a multi-carrier forward link (forward CDMA channel) having a plurality of forward link frequency bins (forward packet channel) (Fig. 7 and col. 5, lines 16-26); and designating a reverse link having at least one reverse link frequency bin (reverse packet channels) (Fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 27-38). A frequency bin is defined in the specification as "a 1.25 MHz band within a band class" (page 12, lines 6-7). Tiedemann possibly does not expressly state that each frequency bin consists of a 1.25 MHz band within a band class. Proctor discloses, in a wireless communication system, that it is well-known to have a forward packet channel consists of a 1.2288 MHz band within a band class (frequency spectrum) (Fig. 2 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 34) where since each code channel (traffic channel) is spread over a 1.2288 MHz band, each code channel (traffic channel) is a 1.2288 MHz band within the frequency spectrum. While the 1.288 MHz band is not exactly 1.25 MHz, the two bands are so approximately equal. It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust,

vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on applicant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937); Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 471 (1943); In re Schneider, 148 F.2d 108, 65 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1945); In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1055); In re Saether, 492 F.2d 849, 181 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1974); In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the 1.288 MHz band to be 1.25 MHz, especially since it is well known in the art to add extra frequency spectrum around a range to guard against noise from other parts of the spectrum. Tiedemann in view of Proctor possibly does not expressly disclose that the forward link frequency bins and the reverse link frequency bin are designated such that bandwidth of the forward link is allocated differently from bandwidth of the reverse link. Walton teaches designating the forward link frequency bins and the reverse link frequency bin such that bandwidth of the forward link is allocated differently from bandwidth of the reverse link because "a significant number of data applications have asymmetric traffic requirements" (col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to designate the forward link frequency bins and the reverse link frequency bin such that bandwidth of the forward link is allocated differently from bandwidth of the reverse link in order to accommodate different applications which contain different requirements such as asymmetric traffic requirements.

4. Regarding claim 11, referring to claim 10, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses selecting a first forward link frequency bin from the plurality of forward link

frequency bins for forward link transmission (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60), the first forward link frequency bin having an associated first reverse link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60); and selecting a second reverse link frequency bin for reverse link transmission corresponding to the forward link transmission wherein the second reverse link frequency bin is different from the first reverse link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60).

5. Regarding claim 12, referring to claim 11, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses that the selecting a second reverse link frequency bin is based on loading of the system (Tiedemann: col. 1, lines 48-58 and col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60).

6. Regarding claim 13, referring to claim 11, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses selecting a third reverse link frequency bin for reverse link transmission corresponding to the forward link transmission, wherein the third reverse link frequency bin is different from the first and second reverse link frequency bins (Tiedemann: col. 1, lines 48-58 and col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60).

7. Regarding claim 14, referring to claim 10, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton possibly does not expressly disclose that the plurality of forward link frequency bins comprise three frequency bins. However, it is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system

absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on applicant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937); Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 471 (1943); In re Schneider, 148 F.2d 108, 65 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1945); In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1055); In re Saether, 492 F.2d 849, 181 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1974); In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Tiedemann discloses using N frequency bins. Defining this N to be three would have been obvious absent a showing of criticality.

8. Regarding claim 15, referring to claim 10, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses that the plurality of forward link frequency bins are adjacent frequency bins (Tiedemann: Fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 16-26 and Proctor: Fig. 2 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 34) where since the channels are transmitted in the same frequency band but with different spreading codes (Proctor: Fig. 2 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 34), the channels, as broadly defined, are adjacent since adjacent can mean "not distant."

9. Regarding claim 16, referring to claim 11, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses that the multi-carrier forward link (forward CDMA link) is adapted for transmission of a plurality of code channels (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-26 and Proctor: Fig. 2 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 34), wherein one of said plurality of code channels is used to communicate power control information for said second reverse link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 6, lines 56-61) where a code channel and a frequency bin are equivalent.

10. Regarding claim 17, Tiedemann discloses a method in a wireless communication system (col. 4, lines 53-61), comprising: receiving communications on a multi-carrier forward link

(forward CDMA channel), the multi-carrier forward link having a plurality of forward link frequency bins (forward packet channel) (Fig. 7 and col. 5, lines 16-26), the reverse link having at least one frequency bin (reverse packet channels) (Fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 27-38). A frequency bin is defined in the specification as "a 1.25 MHz band within a band class" (page 12, lines 6-7). Tiedemann possibly does not expressly state that each frequency bin consists of a 1.25 MHz band within a band class. Proctor discloses, in a wireless communication system, that it is well-known to have a forward packet channel consists of a 1.2288 MHz band within a band class (frequency spectrum) (Fig. 2 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 34) where since each code channel (traffic channel) is spread over a 1.2288 MHz band, each code channel (traffic channel) is a 1.2288 MHz band within the frequency spectrum. While the 1.288 MHz band is not exactly 1.25 MHz, the two bands are so approximately equal. It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on applicant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937); Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 471 (1943); In re Schneider, 148 F.2d 108, 65 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1945); In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1055); In re Saether, 492 F.2d 849, 181 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1974); In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the 1.288 MHz band to be 1.25 MHz, especially since it is well known in the art to add extra frequency spectrum around a range to guard against noise from other parts of the spectrum. Tiedemann in view of Proctor possibly does not expressly disclose that the forward link frequency bins and the reverse

link frequency bin are configured such that the allocation of bandwidth for the forward and reverse link transmissions are variable. Walton teaches configuring the forward link frequency bins and the reverse link frequency bin such that the allocation of bandwidth for the forward and reverse link transmissions are variable in order to accommodate different applications which contain different requirements such as asymmetric traffic requirements (col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to configure the forward link frequency bins and the reverse link frequency bin such that the allocation of bandwidth for the forward and reverse link transmissions are variable in order to accommodate different applications which contain different requirements such as asymmetric traffic requirements.

11. Regarding claim 18, referring to claim 17, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses receiving by a first device a communication on a forward link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60), the forward link frequency bin having an associated first reverse link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60); and transmitting by a second device via a second reverse link frequency bin, wherein said second reverse link frequency bin is different from the first reverse link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60).

12. Regarding claim 19, referring to claim 18, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses receiving by the first device an indication of a reverse link frequency bin

(Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 31-39) where the overhead message contains an indication of a reverse frequency bin.

13. Regarding claim 20, Tiedemann discloses an apparatus in a wireless communication system (col. 4, lines 53-61), comprising: a first means for transmitting information on a multi-carrier forward link (forward CDMA channel) (Fig. 7 and col. 5, lines 16-26), wherein said multi-carrier forward link comprises a plurality of forward link frequency bins (forward packet channel) (Fig. 7 and col. 5, lines 16-26); and a second means for designating a reverse link frequency bin (reverse packet channels) (Fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 27-38). A frequency bin is defined in the specification as "a 1.25 MHz band within a band class" (page 12, lines 6-7). Tiedemann possibly does not expressly state that each frequency bin consists of a 1.25 MHz band within a band class. Proctor discloses, in a wireless communication system, that it is well-known to have a forward packet channel consists of a 1.2288 MHz band within a band class (frequency spectrum) (Fig. 2 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 34) where since each code channel (traffic channel) is spread over a 1.2288 MHz band, each code channel (traffic channel) is a 1.2288 MHz band within the frequency spectrum. While the 1.288 MHz band is not exactly 1.25 MHz, the two bands are so approximately equal. It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on applicant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937); Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 471 (1943); In re Schneider, 148 F.2d 108, 65 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1945); In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1055); In re Saether, 492 F.2d 849, 181 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1974); In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6

(CCPA 1977); In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the 1.288 MHz band to be 1.25 MHz, especially since it is well known in the art to add extra frequency spectrum around a range to guard against noise from other parts of the spectrum. Tiedemann in view of Proctor possibly does not expressly disclose that the first and second means configure the frequency bins so as to enable differential allocation of bandwidth for forward link and reverse link transmissions. Walton teaches having means configure the frequency bins so as to enable differential allocation of bandwidth for forward link and reverse link transmissions in order to accommodate different applications which contain different requirements such as asymmetric traffic requirements (col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the first and second means configure the frequency bins so as to enable differential allocation of bandwidth for forward link and reverse link transmissions in order to accommodate different applications which contain different requirements such as asymmetric traffic requirements.

14. Regarding claim 21, referring to claim 20, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton discloses means for selecting a first forward link frequency bin from the plurality of forward link frequency bins for the forward link transmission (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60), the first forward link frequency bin having an associated first reverse link frequency bins (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60); and means for selecting a second reverse link frequency bin for the reverse link transmission corresponding to the forward link transmission, wherein the second

reverse link frequency bin is different from the first reverse link frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38 and Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60).

15. Regarding claim 22, referring to claim 10, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton disclose that the designations of the forward and reverse link includes allocating more bandwidth for the forward link than the reverse link (Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60).

16. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiedemann, Jr. (USPN 5,604,730) in view of Proctor (USPN 6,222,832) in further view of Walton, Jr. et al (USPN 5,621,723) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

17. Regarding claim 23, referring to claim 10, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton possibly does not expressly disclose that the designation of the forward link includes configuring the forward link as a cdma2000 3X forward link. Applicant discloses that cdma2000 3X forward links are well known in the art since cdma2000 expands "the capabilities of the preceding technologies to include wireless e-mail, Web browsing, and corporate and local network access, as well as videoconferencing, e-commerce and multimedia" (page 4, lines 1-page 6, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to configure the forward link as a cdma2000 3X forward link in order to allow the wireless system to expand the capabilities of the preceding technologies.

18. Regarding claim 24, referring to claim 23, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art discloses that the forward link includes first, second, and third carriers (Applicant: page 4, lines 1-page 6, line 8).

19. Regarding claim 25, referring to claim 24, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art discloses that the first, second, and third carriers occupy first, second, and third adjacent frequency bins, respectively (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38; Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60; and Applicant: page 4, lines 1-page 6, line 8).

20. Regarding claim 26, referring to claim 25, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art suggests configuring the reverse link as a cdma2000 1X reverse link (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38; Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60; and Applicant: page 4, lines 1-page 6, line 8) in order to allow asymmetric applications that do not need the full 3X reverse link to efficiently utilize system bandwidth during operation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to configure the reverse link as a cdma2000 1X reverse link in order to allow asymmetric applications that do not need the full 3X reverse link to efficiently utilize system bandwidth during operation.

21. Regarding claim 27, referring to claim 26, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art suggests that reverse link includes a fourth carrier (Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60 and Applicant: page 4, lines 1-page 6, line 8).

22. Regarding claim 28, referring to claim 27, Tiedemann in view of Proctor in further view of Walton in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art suggests that the fourth carrier is located in a frequency range substantially similar to the second frequency bin (Tiedemann: col. 5, lines 16-45 esp. col. 5, lines 31-38; Walton: col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 67; col. 4, lines 48-67; and col. 5, lines 37-60; and Applicant: page 4, lines 1-page 6, line 8) since in Walton, the reverse carriers could be anywhere within the frequency spectrum allotted for reverse channel communications.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Virtanen (USPN 5,963,548) see col. 1, line 52-col. 2, line 38 which pertain to asymmetric forward and reverse links in CDMA. Gitlin et al (USPN 5,442,625) see entire document which pertains to variable data rates in CDMA. Kim et al (USPN 6,320,851) see col. 3, line 21-col. 5, line 60 which pertain to asymmetric forward and reverse links in CDMA.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (703)305-6970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-5:00 with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703)308-6602. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-6743 for regular communications and (703)308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

DJR

Daniel J. Ryman
June 16, 2003

Daniel J. Ryman
Examiner
Art Unit 2665

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600